UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,761	03/06/2002	Tejaswini Hosali	YOR920010756US1	6849

7590	09/20/2004	

Samuel A. Kassatly
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA 95120

EXAMINER
ORTIZ, BELIX M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/091,761	Applicant(s) HOSALI ET AL.
	Examiner Belix M. Ortiz	Art Unit 2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <u>Gusack</u>

(U.S. patent 6,112,209).

As to claim 1, <u>Gusack</u> teaches a method for dynamically linking at least two

dissimilar databases (see figures 1, 6, 9 and 23, and column 6, 47-52), comprising:

linking the two dissimilar databases by means of a pointers database that

contains a smaller number of records than a number of records contained in

either one of the at least two dissimilar databases (see figure 9); and

changing relationships between records in the at least two dissimilar

databases by changing records in the pointers database, without changing the

records in the at least two dissimilar databases (see column 40, lines 9-16).

As to claims 2, 9, and 16, <u>Gusack</u> teaches wherein a ratio of the number of

records contained in the pointers database to the number of records contained in either

one or the at least two dissimilar databases ranges between approximately

0.005% and 5% (see figure 1, it is obvious that the ratio of number of record on the pointer database deemed to include smaller database).

As to claims 3, 10, and 17, Gusack teaches wherein the at least two dissimilar databases include a customer database and an organization database (see figures 1 and 2; column 30, lines 63-67; and column 31, lines 1-3).

As to claim 4, Gusack teaches wherein changing relationships between fields in the at least two dissimilar databases is initiated by changes to a record in the customer database (see column 31, lines 1-3).

As to claims 5 and 12, Gusack teaches wherein changes to the record in the customer database include changes to any one or more of: status change, location, country of residence, importance of business relationship, volume of business, and credit worthiness (see figures 1-4).

As to claim 6, Gusack teaches wherein changing relationships between records in the at least two dissimilar databases is initiated by changes to a record in the organization database (see column 3, lines 23-25).

As to claims 7 and 14, <u>Gusack</u> teaches wherein changes to the record in the organization database includes changes to any one or more of: organization hierarchy type, branch office, responsibility, and geopolitical status (see column 10, lines 46-51).

As to claim 8, <u>Gusack</u> teaches a computer program for dynamically linking at least two dissimilar databases (see figures 1, 6, 9 and 23, and column 6, 47-52), comprising:

a first set of program instructions for linking the two dissimilar databases by means of a pointers database that contains a smaller number of records than a number of records contained in either one of the at least two dissimilar databases (see figure 9); and

a second set of program instructions for changing relationships between records in the at least two dissimilar databases by changing records in the pointers database, without changing the records in the at least two dissimilar databases (see column 40, lines 9-16).

As to claim 11, <u>Gusack</u> teaches wherein the second set of program instructions includes changes to a record in the customer database (see column 31, lines 1-3).

As to claim 13, <u>Gusack</u> teaches wherein the second set of program instructions includes changes to a record in the organization database (see column 3, lines 23-25).

As to claim 15, <u>Gusack</u> teaches a system for dynamically linking at least two dissimilar databases (see figures 1, 6, 9 and 23, and column 6, 47-52), comprising:

means for linking the two dissimilar databases by means of a pointers database that contains a smaller number of records than a number of records contained in either one of the at least two dissimilar databases (see figure 9); and

means for changing relationships between records in the at least two dissimilar databases by changing records in the pointers database, without changing the records in the at least two dissimilar databases (see column 40, lines 9-16).

As to claim 18, <u>Gusack</u> teaches wherein the changing means includes changes to a record in the customer database (see column 31, lines 1-3).

As to claim 19, <u>Gusack</u> teaches wherein the changing means includes changes to a record in the organization database (see column 3, lines 23-25).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to linking database using pointers:

U.S Patent No. 5,899,988 to <u>Depledge et al.</u>: for teaching bitmapped indexing with high granularity locking

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Belix M. Ortiz whose telephone number is 703-305-7605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

bmo

September 15, 2004

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER